

7m



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/988,918	11/19/2001	Linus Fredriksson	4925-153	9371

7590 10/22/2004
COHEN, PONTANI, LIEBERMAN & PAVANE
Suite 1210
551 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10176

EXAMINER

PITARO, RYAN F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 10/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/988,918	Applicant(s) FREDRIKSSON ET AL.	
	Examiner Ryan F Pitaro	Art Unit 2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 November 2001.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.
- 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-78 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-78 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 - 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 04/02/2004.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-78 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dobbelaar ("Dobbelaar", US# 6,538,672) in view of Jenson et al ("Jenson", US#6,236,396).

As per independent claim 1, Dobbelaar discloses displaying panels on a display associated with an electronic device (Figure 3 element 23), the panels being arranged into two bars of panels with a common focus panel (Figure 3 element 23), wherein the focus panel identifies (a) a currently selectable lowest level in the hierarchy and (b) the next higher level, if any (Figure 3; *bottom axis (30)*; Column 7 lines 63-65), wherein levels, if any, in the hierarchy higher than that displayed in the focus panel are identified in one of at least one box, other panels of the first bar identifying groups in the hierarchy in the next higher level identified in the focus panel (Figure 3; *wherein all levels higher than that displayed in the focus panel are still shown i.e. 14:00 and BBC or 15:00 & CBS*). However, Dobbelaar fails to distinctly point out using calendar information with this display. Jenson teaches a method for displaying calendar information in a display

Art Unit: 2174

(Column 8 lines 51-54) with an electronic device (Column 3 lines 18-25) comprising: organizing a plurality of calendar entries into a hierarchy comprising a plurality of calendar groups (Column 5 lines 20-26; *categorized by year, month*) at least one of which calendar groups having at least one sublevel of calendar subgroups (Column 5 lines 20-26; *year being grouped month being subgroup*), each of the panels being linked to one of the plurality of calendar entries (Column 7 lines 66-67 Column 8 lines 31-36; *wherein groups are combined and one date is selected*). Wherein panels of the second two bars each identify one of calendar entries (Column 8 lines 84-86). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the two bar interface of Dobbelaar with the calendar interface of Jenson. Motivation to do so would have been organize by time and date in a more convenient fashion.

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, the modified Dobbelaar discloses a method wherein the two bars are sized and positioned on the display so as to permit viewing of a substantial portion of a background image presented on the display (Dobbelaar, Column 1 lines 62-63).

As per claim 3, which is dependant on claim 1, the modified Dobbelaar discloses a method wherein the two bars are perpendicular to one another (Dobbelaar, Figure 3).

As per claim 4, which is dependant on claim 3, the modified Dobbelaar discloses a method wherein each of the two bars are positioned on the display to proximate an edge of the display (Dobbelaar, Figure 3; *wherein the apparatus may comprise means for moving the axis to another position Column 5 lines 55-56*).

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 3, the modified Dobbelaar discloses a method wherein each of the two bars are positioned on the display to be parallel to an edge of the display (Dobbelaar, Figure 3).

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, the modified Dobbelaar discloses a method wherein the two bars are displayed on the display only upon entry of a command by a user (Dobbelaar, Column 5 lines 50-52).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, the modified Dobbelaar discloses a method wherein the calendar groups comprise months of the year (Jenson, Column 5 lines 20-26).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 7, the modified Dobbelaar discloses a method wherein the calendar groups comprise weeks of the year (Jenson, Figure 5c and Column 8 lines 57-62).

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 7, the modified Dobbelaar discloses a method wherein the calendar groups comprise days of the year (Jenson, Column 8 lines 4-6).

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 8, the modified Dobbelaar discloses a method wherein the calendar groups comprise days of the year (Jenson, Column 8 lines 4-6).

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 9, the modified Dobbelaar discloses a method wherein the calendar entries correspond to discrete time periods within a day (Jenson, Figure 5c; *time periods 8-6*).

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 10, the modified Dobbelaar discloses a method wherein the calendar entries correspond to discrete time periods within a day (Jenson, Figure 5c; *time periods 8-6*).

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 11, the modified Dobbelaar discloses a method wherein each calendar entry is capable of storing information associated with the associated discrete time period (Jenson, Figure 5c; *staff and strategy*).

As per claim 14, which is dependent on claim 12, the modified Dobbelaar discloses a method wherein each calendar entry is capable of storing information associated with the associated discrete time period (Jenson, Figure 5c; *staff and strategy*).

As per claim 15, which is dependent on claim 1, the modified Dobbelaar discloses a method wherein a currently selected lowest level in the hierarchy identified in the focus panel is changed upon the entry of a navigation command by the user on an input device (Dobbelaar, Column 7 lines 22-33).

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 1, the modified Dobbelaar discloses a method wherein calendar entries, groups, or subgroups linked to the panel are identified on the panels by text (Dobbelaar, Figure 3; *text titles*).

As per claim 17, which is dependent on claim 1, the modified Dobbelaar discloses a method wherein at least one of the panels is one of the semi-transparent and transparent (Dobbelaar, Column 2 lines 8-9)

As per claim 18, which is dependent on claim 1, the modified Dobbelaar discloses a method wherein scrolling through panels in a bar will cause panels of the other bar to change as appropriate (Dobbelaar, Column 3 lines 66-67 and Column 4 lines 1-4).

Claims 19, 40,58 are individually similar in scope to claim 1, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 20, which is dependent on claim 19, the modified Dobbelaar discloses a method wherein navigating between different levels of groups is accomplished by selecting with an input device a desired group level (Dobbelaar, Column 6 lines 1-5).

As per claim 21, which is dependent on claim 20, the modified Dobbelaar discloses a method wherein selecting a desired group level with the input device comprises activating a button on the input device (Dobbelaar, Column 6 lines 1-5)

As per claim 22, which is dependent of claim 20, the modified Dobbelaar discloses a method wherein selecting a desired group level with the input device comprises selecting a box on the display (Dobbelaar, Column lines 1-5;*Figure 3 element 23 wherein pictogram is a box*).

As per claim 23, which is dependent on claim 19, the modified Dobbelaar discloses a method wherein navigating between different levels of groups is accomplished by causing the panels of one of the two bars to move (Dobbelaar, Column 7 lines 22-26) and selecting with an input device the group in the focus panel (Dobbelaar, Column 7 lines 22-26;*currently selected as in column 6 lines 1-5*).

Claims 24,41,63 are individually similar in scope to claim 2, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 25,42,64 are individually similar in scope to claim 3, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 26,43,65 are individually similar in scope to claim 4, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 27,44,66 are individually similar in scope to claim 5, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 28,45,67 are individually similar in scope to claim 6, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 29,46,68 are individually similar in scope to claim 7, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 30,47,69 are individually similar in scope to claim 8, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 31,48,70 are individually similar in scope to claim 9, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 32,49,71 are individually similar in scope to claim 10, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 33,50,72 are individually similar in scope to claim 11, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 34,51,73 are individually similar in scope to claim 12, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 35,52,74 are individually similar in scope to claim 13, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 36,53,75, are individually similar in scope to claim 14, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 37,55,76 are individually similar in scope to claim 16, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 38,56,77 are individually similar in scope to claim 17, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 39,57,78 are individually similar in scope to claim 18, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 54 is individually similar in scope to claim 15, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 59 is individually similar in scope to claim 20, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 60 is individually similar in scope to claim 21, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 61 is individually similar in scope to claim 22, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 62 is individually similar in scope to claim 23, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- US-6,323,883 B1- scrollable calendar method.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ryan Pitaro whose telephone number is (703) 605-1205. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm Monday through Thursday, and every other Friday. The Patent Office is moving, after mid October the new telephone number where Ryan Pitaro can be reached is (571) 272 – 4071.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ryan Pitaro
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2174

RFP

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Application/Control Number: 09/988,918
Art Unit: 2174

Page 10